

# Small Table Reports for Community Workshop:

## Single Family Homes & Tree Regulations



Points discussed on Nov. 18<sup>th</sup>

Key Questions for Dec. 7th

### 1. *Single Family House Size.*

- Maximum of 5,000 square feet with a sliding scale incorporating lot size and slope to reduce the maximum size, as appropriate.
- Add more flexibility for unusual cases.
- Need neighbor input if significant impacts could occur.
- Also, use daylight plane and building envelope plane, and consider topography and architectural design.
- Don't count garage space in floor area.
- Setbacks should be used to address this issue.

*While only a small number of new homes have been proposed at the current limit, increasing the maximum, with a sliding scale and other refinements as proposed, seems to make sense. Do you concur? Any additional concerns?*

### 2. *House Design and Neighborhood "Fit".*

- Yes for additional standards for setbacks and for nonconforming provisions.
- Nonconforming additions only towards the back: OK as long as following line of house but not OK for second story; step it back.
- Some didn't like decks, porches, etc. projecting into yards.
- No flexibility for going up with nonconforming setbacks.
- Respond to desire that homes fit in their neighborhoods.
- Concerns about enforcement of design and overregulation.

*Community input on November 18<sup>th</sup> seemed to support additional standards to regulate bulk and mass. There was also support to allow additions on nonconforming homes to follow existing side setbacks, but not for upper-stories. Is this the right direction to go? Any refinements?*

### 3. *Parking.*

- Most wanted garages for new homes.
- Many OK with carports for existing homes; others against.
- Consensus: need to provide exceptions for older homes with one car garages.
- Same size garages are unreasonable; base rule on home size; 20' x 20' is too large for smaller homes and in some areas.
- Do not penalize owners for adding rooms; use average number of cars people own as opposed to number of bedrooms and base rule on square footage of house and/or lot size.
- Count all legal parking spaces – covered or uncovered
- Second units should trigger more parking on-site.

*While no clear consensus emerged, a more nuanced approach to off-street parking seems needed, with recognition of existing homes with one-car garages and standards based on likely car ownership, not just a bedroom count. Do you support these suggestions?*

# Small Table Reports for Community Workshop:

## Single Family Homes & Tree Regulations



Points discussed on Nov. 18<sup>th</sup>

Key questions for Dec. 7th

### 4. *Trees.*

- Rules should treat maintenance and development the same (new construction resulting in a loss of a tree).
- Allow removal of diseased trees; don't charge at all.
- Allow thinning of trees within a lot, not visible from the street.
- Protect native, healthy trees and large trees at 24" DBH; don't limit to heritage trees only.
- Simpler ordinance; 1:1 replacement.
- People should engage neighbors more if a tree that crosses a lot line needs to be removed (mediation concept).

*The consensus seems to be to make the rules more straightforward, with more reasonable fees, but also greater protection for native trees, healthy trees and large trees throughout the community. Are there additional changes that should be considered?*

### 5. *Second Units.*

- Some OK with reduction to 1,000 sq. ft.; others prefer 640 or 670 sq. ft. maximum or base on lot size.
- If a second unit is added within existing envelope, it shouldn't matter – no limit on square footage should be set for these units.
- Size of unit: index according to FAR; no maximum size.
- CUP for units on lots less than 5,000 sq. ft.
- Don't need to reduce max; no cap.

*A total of 4 second units have been built since 2008, and only 2 units per year are anticipated over the coming 8 years. Most of those at the last workshop seemed to support the reduction of second unit size to 1,000 sq. ft., but not limiting second unit size for units that are wholly within a home. Is this still correct?*

### 6. *Single Family Design Review – Improving the Process.*

- General support for the proposed "tiered approach" with neighborhood notification and the Planning Commission retaining jurisdiction over larger projects.
- Need more predictability; the approval process shouldn't take so long.
- Some advocated abolishing design review and to hold people to specific understandable standards.

*Most of those reporting out at workshop seemed to favor the tiered approach to single family design review, with some refinements to account for lot size or location within the community. Are these the right modifications to make, or are there others?*